

Accepted Manuscript, pre-print version of:

Sarah Potvin, "The Principle and the Pragmatist: On Conflict and Coalescence for Librarian Engagement with Open Access Initiatives," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 39, no. 1 (January 2013): 67-75. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2012.11.002

Sarah Potvin
Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University Libraries
Digital Services and Scholarly Communication
5000 TAMU
College Station Texas, USA 77843-5000
spotvin@library.tamu.edu

The Principle and the Pragmatist¹: On Conflict and Coalescence for Librarian Engagement with Open Access Initiatives

Abstract

This article considers Open Access (OA) training and the supports and structures in place in LIS programs and academic libraries in the United States from the perspective of a new librarian. OA programming is contextualized by the larger project of Scholarly Communication in academic libraries, and the two share a historical focus on journal literature and a continued emphasis on public access and the economics of scholarly publishing. Challenges in preparing academic librarians for involvement with OA efforts include the evolving and potentially divergent nature of the international OA movement and the inherent tensions of a role with both principled and pragmatic components that serves a particular university community as well as a larger movement.

Introduction

Here is the good news about being a freshly minted academic librarian engaged with Open Access (OA) in the United States: By some indicators, a sort of Golden Age of OA implementation is upon us, a crucial moment buoyed by the movement's accomplishments as well as international debates over varieties of OA. The area is new enough that libraries' approaches are not entrenched. Conversely, Scholarly Communication (SC) programs, which often host OA efforts in libraries, are established enough that librarians have experience with SC, library structures have begun to reflect its importance, and longstanding conferences and professional groups can offer orientation and instruction in the area. Three quarters of those Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member libraries responding to a 2007 survey reported engagement with scholarly communication education efforts; another 18% indicated that planning for such initiatives was underway.² There is likely both enthusiasm around the idea of access and enough confusion over what OA is and isn't (i.e., not a single, unified model or the end of peer review) that new librarians will have something to sink their teeth into. With recent developments around the "Academic Spring," the defeat of the Research Work Acts, the launch of the National Institutes of Health Public Access Policy, and several university mandates established around OA faculty publications and ETDs, students and faculty outside of the library are potentially aware of and interested in OA.

Other good news: recent Library/Information School (LIS³) graduates may have encountered a curriculum that addressed issues and competencies related to OA, copyright and authors rights, Creative Commons, electronic records, institutional repositories, and even Digital Humanities, digital curation, data management, digital publishing, and E-science.⁴ They may have benefitted from the many IMLS-funded

initiatives to develop curricula in these areas, or have made contacts and learned new skills at related internships.

That is the good news.

The harder news is that many academic research libraries (like many LIS programs) are struggling to rationalize and redefine their place in the context of universities that are themselves confronted with shrinking support.⁵ Debates over how to make MLIS students into librarians have raged long, and reforms have been implemented in the form of required internships, graduate assistantships, practicums, or research projects, shifting core curricula, a proliferation of courses aimed at building digital competencies, or, from the library side, formal mentoring and orientation programs.⁶ It may be a librarian's first year in the library—or even first several years—that solidifies both a specialization and a response to librarianship, with its customs, values, and systems.

While library school may have bestowed a sense of purpose and strategy, the library itself can both moderate and strengthen positions, introducing new librarians to structures and stakeholders not always detailed in the readings. As with any workplace, libraries function and evolve according to rules that are not immediately evident. New librarians, too, bring their own experiences and expectations to bear on their positions. In a process known as “organizational socialization,” a new employee “acquires the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behavior he or she needs to participate effectively as a member of an organization.”⁷ This process of acquiring organizational knowledge and skills and navigating a new environment can be bewildering. Surveyed about their acclimation, new librarians in Canada frequently mentioned difficulties around “getting things done,” referencing “concerns such as when and how to take initiative, how to work around difficult supervisors, dealing with resistance to change, and getting people to listen to their ideas.”⁸

This article considers OA training and the supports and structures in place in academic libraries from the perspective of a new librarian. What is OA's place in the larger project of SC? What consensus, if any, joins academic libraries' efforts in these areas, and what are the origins of this involvement? What roles might librarians play in OA? What skills might new librarians bring to this area, and what expectations are in place for those joining and managing these efforts? To this end, I consider the scope of OA and SC, briefly examine the multiple histories of academic libraries' efforts and ambitions around OA and SC, and survey and make recommendations around the development of roles and competencies in OA for new and established librarians.

These inquiries will be met with complexity and considerable uncertainty. Certainly, OA has been championed on a larger scale by such organizations as ARL (in a recent editorial, ARL Executive Director Charles Lowry remarked: “Advocacy for OA is

expected from ARL...”⁹). However, “OA” itself is an evolving, multifaceted effort, and research libraries, functioning within the ecosystems of larger universities, have developed and staffed initiatives in SC that may define and prioritize OA differently. MLIS programs have likely done the same. Unfortunately, no data was forthcoming on whether and how LIS programs are introducing OA into their curricula or how systematically academic libraries have defined, incorporated, and embraced OA.¹⁰

What is Open Access?

In recent remarks to the 158th ARL Membership Meeting, Dieter Stein, convener of the Berlin 9 OA conference, observed: “Now, what is Open Access? And this is where the politics start already.”¹¹

“Open Access” evokes multifaceted and, at times, disputed description. To many, it is a business model for scholarly publishing, with the particulars of Gold, Hybrid, and Green forms debated and dissected.¹² On a larger scale, it is a question of national policy, international trends and declarations, funding mandates, and compliance. It is inextricable from digital scholarship, a movement that hinges on the potential to electronically deliver and preserve research. Some describe OA as “inevitable”¹³; others as “unsustainable.”¹⁴

OA can also form an ethics of access or publication, of obtainment or dissemination. It is “a kind of access, not a kind of business model, license, or content.”¹⁵ Because materials are freely available online, OA can dredge up fears of plagiarized, misattributed, or resold material or signal a commitment to making high quality research freely available to scholars and the general public worldwide, with an emphasis on developing countries.

OA incurs different emphases surrounding pricing and permissions, or “gratis” or “libre” forms. Separately defined by the seminal Budapest (2002)¹⁶, Bethesda (2003)¹⁷, and Berlin (2003)¹⁸ statements, OA’s common definition, Peter Suber argues, incurs both “free online access” and the granting of “user permission for all legitimate scholarly uses.”¹⁹ Suber’s definition, with its provisions for both pricing and permissions, is held to be on the “libre” spectrum of OA; while Stevan Harnad’s, with its focus on pricing rather than permissions, is inclined towards “gratis.” Harnad stresses the type of materials and availability, defining OA as “immediate, permanent, free online access to the full text of *all refereed research journal articles*.”²⁰ A user guide developed with sponsorship from the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) presents the “Open Access Spectrum” to help users determine openness by considering “Reader Rights,” “Reuse Rights,” “Copyrights,” “Author Posting Rights,” “Automatic Posting,” and “Machine Readability” as defining components of OA.²¹

OA has diffused into institutions and across scholarship in uneven patches; in so doing, it has changed the makeup of stakeholders. Recent OA-related mandates and policies, encompassing works other than refereed journal articles, such as monographs, student works, and grey literature, have disrupted some of the more closely defined parameters of the early OA movement and have changed the focus that libraries initially advocated on serials pricing solutions. OA policies have also altered practices for those disciplines and researchers tied to federal funding. For faculty in universities with faculty-elected institutional OA mandates or guidelines, such policies have introduced new workflows and compliance measures. Graduate students have found themselves subject to OA publishing requirements for their theses and dissertations, which has sometimes sparked debates over impact, the ownership of student work, and the need for discipline- or genre-specific rules.²² OA options or requirements have incurred broader, international exposure to scholarship deposited in institutional or disciplinary repositories or other digital platforms.²³ However, implementation has at times veered from voluntary or author/faculty-driven initiatives into the realm of potential coercion.²⁴

OA constitutes a global movement. But the development, implementation, and support of OA-friendly policies or mandates on campuses require localized, focused outreach and services. In educating and encouraging faculty and students to adopt OA approaches, librarians must integrate skills and functions related to SC and publishing, including marketing, rights clearance and authors rights outreach, and running and supporting software or platforms for distribution. Different models within academic libraries may employ a single librarian or small unit charged with campus outreach around OA, undertake a “mainstreaming” approach through liaisons, subject, and reference librarians, or employ a hybrid model.²⁵ By their nature, these models require engagement beyond the library, with stakeholders throughout the university.

A Brief History of OA and SC

The history of OA efforts in libraries is entwined with SC. The OA movement in academic libraries has gained momentum recently through faculty-adopted mandates and policy changes such as the NIH requirement. In its broadest sense, SC encompasses all scholarly publishing and exchange and could thus be seen as central to the activity of research libraries since their inception. More recently, SC has emerged as a rapidly evolving specialization and dedicated librarian position, encompassing a range of programming. As one recent article noted: “Scholarly communication programs are nearly as diverse as the institutions that support them, and the individual components of these programs tend to be highly specific to the institution in question.”²⁶

Within libraries, OA initiatives might be identified with SC programs, particularly with the public face or outreach components of these programs. The editors of the *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* address the overlap in their inaugural issue: “To the casual observer, ‘scholarly communication’ in many academic libraries would appear to be synonymous with ‘open access’. ... for the past 30 years, academic libraries’ most visible engagement with scholarly communication has centered on transforming the economics of scholarly publishing.”²⁷ A 2007 ARL SPEC Kit echoed this emphasis: “Ten years ago, SC education mostly focused on fair use and copyright restrictions. Now, open access, authors rights management, institutional repositories, and the economics of scholarly publishing are the topics of these education initiatives.”²⁸

The history of SC in libraries points to this focus on “transforming the economics of scholarly publishing,” for which OA has only relatively recently emerged as a particular or viable approach.²⁹ ARL’s involvement with SC has been continually incited by economic concerns. As Mary Case, a former director of ARL’s Office of Scholarly Communication (OSC), writes, in 1988, ARL was prompted by the rising prices of serials to dedicate attention, in the form of a project, to what became known as the “serials crisis.” The project produced the compilation *Report of the ARL Serial Prices Project*, which included two “contractor reports.”³⁰ Beyond confirming and documenting the crisis, the *Report* identified its causes and recommended solutions.

Ann Okerson, who would go on to serve as the first director of OSC, authored three recommendations that, Case claims, would continue to “[guide] the work of the OSC for almost 20 years.”³¹ The first of these focuses on immediate publicity around the serials crisis in ARL libraries, while the other two “involve major systemic modifications of the existing system of scholarly publishing.”³² They read, in part:

“RECOMMENDATION 2. ARL should strongly advocate the transfer of publication of research results from serials produced by commercial publishers to existing non-commercial channels. ARL should specifically encourage the creation of innovative non-profit alternatives to traditional commercial publishers.”³³

“RECOMMENDATION 3. ARL should strongly advocate that University administrations and granting agencies change their policies for judging promotion, tenure, and funding, so as to minimize current pressures for excessive publication. ARL should monitor the implementation of such changes and report the extent to which Universities and funding agencies participate.”³⁴

Prompted by the *Report*, ARL members voted “for a supplementary dues increase ‘to launch a multi-faceted program aimed at mobilizing the scholarly, scientific,

academic, and research libraries communities and appropriate governmental agencies to address this major issue.”³⁵ Thus the OSC, originally known as the Office of Scientific and Academic Publishing, was formed but faced barriers, over the next decade of collaboration between ARL and the Association of American Universities, to consensus for action between or within these groups.

The serials—or pricing—crisis prompted academic libraries’ advocacy of non-commercial publishers. However, with the advent of widespread electronic publishing, the movement in libraries has grown to encompass new areas, including free online access. In 1989, Okerson had advocated: “In view of the public funding of the research reported, non-commercial channels might very well be designated as the first choice of publication for reporting of publicly funded research.”³⁶ In 1998, ARL launched SPARC, in an effort to promote non-commercial publishing alternatives.³⁷ The mission of SPARC has since shifted definitively towards “advancing the understanding and implementation of policies and practices that ensure Open Access (OA) to scholarly research outputs.”³⁸

Permissions and rights issues have also come to the fore as an area of libraries’ focus within OA. As OA advocate Peter Suber claimed in an article aimed at librarians:

“The pricing crisis means that libraries must pay intolerable prices for journals. The permissions crisis means that, even when they pay, libraries are hamstrung by licensing terms and software locks that prevent them from using electronic journals in the same full and free way that they may now use print journals.”³⁹

OA constitutes an embrace of open—rather than simply non-commercial—research publications. With the Budapest Declaration in 2002, OA came to focus primarily on the launch and growth of gold OA journals and green self-archiving in repositories; this focus is in keeping with ARL’s early emphasis on serials.⁴⁰

OA initiatives by such organizations as SPARC, ARL, and the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) have emphasized the provision of outreach to and training of librarians as advocates of transforming SC, with OA as an element of that transformation. ACRL established its Scholarly Communication Task Force in 2000, co-sponsors the ACRL-ARL Institute on Scholarly Communication, and has been active in promoting outreach through conferences, listservs, websites, publications, and a Scholarly Communication Toolkit for use by librarians.⁴¹ The ACRL Roadshow on Scholarly Communication, hosted at libraries and library conferences, includes a module on OA and seeks “to empower participants to help accelerate the transformation of the scholarly communication system.”⁴² In 2012, ARL remains committed to “Advancing Scholarly Communication” as a strategic organizational goal.

Challenges in OA Training

Currently, and despite certain exceptions, efforts at training MLIS students in OA seem to have largely adhered to a “boutique” model appropriate to the relative scarcity of dedicated SC/OA positions in academic libraries. In this model, a prospective academic librarian gains training through optional coursework or specialization at the MLIS level. A student may come to an MLIS program with a strong subject background that will contextualize and shape an interest in SC, perhaps in the overlapping areas of Digital Humanities, E-science, or data curation. Or, having identified an interest in SC or become aware of OA within the context of cohort or faculty engagement, a student may undertake specialized research or pursue a rare internship or fellowship in the area.

Upon earning an MLIS and gaining a position in an academic library, a new librarian is expected to grow into and shape the position, which has itself been forged according to institutional needs and demand.⁴³ As William Cross finds in his analysis of position descriptions: “Scholarly communication is a vital but inchoate discipline in academic librarianship today. Modern practice is poorly-defined within many institutions and idiosyncratic from institution to institution.”⁴⁴ OA work in libraries encompasses a shifting structural, technical, legal, interpretive, ethical, and political framework. Accordingly, the contours of a new academic librarian’s work in OA will depend on the particular position in the library and the structure, mission, and budget of the institution. Any student graduating with an MLIS and without significant pre-professional work touching on the legal, publishing, subject-specific, and policy issues around OA will thus need to hone certain skills and sensibilities on the job and with the aid of continuing training and research.

The challenges in preparing librarians for OA work are manifold. One challenge revolves around how, as OA evolves, competencies for librarians shift accordingly. MLIS programs are thus confronted with the demand to educate students to meet a need that is difficult to identify and which libraries—and universities—are meeting in unpredictable ways. A second challenge relates to the potential for OA work to be mission- or values-driven.

The Shifting Competency Challenge

In a recent scenario exercise around libraries and SC, researchers developed four distinct scenarios for academic libraries’ engagement with SC, based on a literature review, and presented these scenarios to twenty ARL directors. The various scenarios identified needed skills related to data, repositories, and rights management, faculty outreach, subject-specific data curation, archival handling of digital materials, preservation, and digital publishing (including indexing, marketing, production, and editing).⁴⁵ The need for any one of these skills, the exercise concedes, is contingent on which scenarios actually come to fruition.

A notable impediment to students' and librarians' determining and developing competencies for future roles related to OA is academic libraries' collective uncertainty around what libraries' roles are—or will be—in shaping SC generally and responding to OA in particular. Academic libraries are currently structured such that OA responsibilities may be distributed across subject specialists, reference librarians, and liaisons, concentrated in scholarly communication positions or units, and/or pertinent to specialists dedicated to digital projects, collection development, or electronic resources. Given the idiosyncrasies of academic libraries' SC programs, the range of models for staffing these programs, and the unpredictability of the OA movement, is it possible or even desirable to define a set of competencies for librarians interested in this area? How can MLIS programs better serve this evolving area in academic libraries? What is the standard for educating a range of specialists, as well as providing a broad foundation across the profession when the OA movement lacks consensus around appropriate action and focus? Individual libraries' approaches to OA may diverge from those advocated for at the institutional, federal, or international level and, indeed, those outlined by SPARC, ARL, or ACRL.

The “boutique” model of educating MLIS students in SC, wherein students self-identify and pursue specialties in the area, may suit many current SC initiatives in libraries, given the relative scarcity of dedicated jobs—particularly entry-level jobs—in this non-traditional area. But it is inadequate to training future librarians engaged in the more diffuse staffing of OA work. Given the MLIS program's role in establishing a theoretical basis for information professionals, this is a natural place to begin, by producing graduates that are universally aware of SC and the OA movement, regardless of their specialty. While uncertainty around the direction of the OA movement and its potential effect on libraries complicates LIS programs' role, it also provides the rationale for teaching MLIS students about OA's core principles and enabling them to navigate the complex economic, legal, and political framework for OA in particular and SC more generally.

MLIS programs can lay this foundation and enhance it with graduate assistant positions, but on-the-job training within academic libraries and professional development must fill the gap between pedagogy and practice. As a baseline, every academic librarian should understand the principles behind OA and be comfortable performing the functions required to deposit work into an institutional repository. This includes an understanding of the role of institutional- or disciplinary-based repositories, the ability to apply the technical steps necessary to upload work to a repository, and the development of foundational legal knowledge that will enable interpretation of publishing agreements.

In addition to enabling librarians, as scholars and researchers, to make their own work openly accessibly, this knowledge has wider institutional and professional

benefits. It can help close the gap between librarians' attitudes and behaviors around OA⁴⁶; enable and encourage OA outreach beyond the library; provide insight into repository resources that may inform information literacy; and spur conversations and debate within the library around the functionality of publishing platforms and the spectrum of OA. It may help curtail the potential for libraries to misstep in proposing or implementing OA policies. This foundational knowledge may also help provide for a balance of interpretations around Fair Use and other legal principles. Only with the overlapping efforts of MLIS programs, self-study, and formal continuing education within or outside of the library, in the form of workshops, webinars, and programming can this effort of shared understanding and ability be achieved. However, by incorporating these skills as cross-curricular learning objectives in MLIS programs, a strong start can be assured.

The data needed to thoroughly assess what is being taught in MLIS programs and which programs and courses incorporate the principles or tools of OA are not readily available. Students considering MLIS programs may not be attuned to the need to select programs based on these offerings and, even with that awareness, may not have the flexibility to choose.⁴⁷

However, several of the more than fifty ALA-accredited MLIS programs have garnered attention for their innovative approaches to teaching about repositories and their dedication to legal education and digital libraries and systems. Additionally, IMLS grants have funded the development of curricula in areas related to OA, including E-science, digital curation, and Digital Humanities. DigCCurr, a multifaceted IMLS-funded project based at the University of North Carolina, has developed master's- and doctoral-level curricula focused on digital curation, in addition to offering continuing professional training and holding symposia. In a presentation at the 2007 DigCCurr symposium on "Building Capabilities for Digital Curation Repositories," researchers from Drexel University's College of Information Science and Technology discussed their building of a simple, "student-friendly" repository; the pedagogical goal of the repository was to demonstrate core functionality and principles of repositories and digital library systems without burdening students with the complexity of a live system.⁴⁸

Anecdotally, new academic librarians engaged with SC report having discovered and pursued the area of specialization without the benefit of a dedicated track or set of classes in their MLIS programs; rather, they cobbled together their training with the assistance of mentors, internships, select courses, and research. Those students enrolled in MLIS programs without strong digital or legal components benefit from the widespread availability of open educational resources related to OA. Fittingly, and in an example of aligned principle and practice, many OA-related symposia, conferences, toolkits, and authors make their materials freely available online. Students might also seek out internships, jobs, and volunteer opportunities that offer further exposure and training in OA.

Skills related to OA may be cross-disciplinary and thus, even when they are covered in MLIS programs, they may not be integrated into academic librarian “tracks” but spread out across the curriculum. One University of Michigan student reports having been introduced to data curation in a digital preservation class. A recent panel revealed a classic chicken-and-egg problem persistent in training for data curation, one that might extend to SC: As an emergent field, there are few professionals who might provide mentorship or insight into the employment landscape. As a result, students and educators alike have difficulty identifying potential jobs and developing skillsets that will align.⁴⁹

ALA’s Core Competencies of Librarianship competencies include several items related to librarians’ work with OA. The Core Competencies, approved and adopted as official policy in 2009, set forth “the basic knowledge to be possessed by all persons graduating from an ALA-accredited master’s program in library and information studies.”⁵⁰ Under the category of “Foundations of the Profession” are listed competencies relating to advocacy, the history of communication, libraries’ place in a democratic society, information trends of significance, and analysis of complex problems. Notably, they also include knowledge of “the legal framework within which libraries and information agencies operate,” including copyright and privacy laws, and “The ethics, values, and foundational principles of the library and information profession.”⁵¹

Despite the admonishment that graduates “should know and, where appropriate, be able to employ” competencies in the forty-one knowledge areas, distributed across eight areas, graduating students are not tested on these competencies; this knowledge is not enforceable or truly mandated.⁵² The potential impossibility of achieving the core competencies over the course of an MLIS--and the integral value of continued training--is acknowledged in the document itself, in the form of a competency mandating knowledge of “The necessity of continuing professional development of practitioners in libraries and other information agencies.”⁵³

The cross-disciplinary training needed for work in SC also extends into the realm of legal education. With the emphasis on self-archiving and the accompanying demand to understand, interpret, and negotiate rights comes a need to provide outreach, education, and training in copyright, while maintaining a distinction between library outreach and the unauthorized provision of legal advice. For specialists, this training may, indeed, be obtained by earning a professional legal degree—but it need not. As Cross finds, SC position descriptions suggest “major trends across the positions,” with emphases on legal and digital responsibilities embedded in job titles but little consensus “on the issue of legal credentials”; fewer than a third of position descriptions that include degree requirements specify the Juris Doctoris (JD), while all require an ALA-accredited masters.⁵⁴

As Cross and Edwards observe: “The practice of modern academic librarianship relies on a sophisticated, but often misunderstood, legal infrastructure.”⁵⁵ Despite this reliance, legal instruction in library schools is unpredictable. In surveying the courses and requirements that ALA-accredited MLIS programs listed on their websites, they found that, while several offer multiple courses in legal education or even specialization, “None ... require a course specifically dedicated to legal education, and the limited classes that are offered are often based on law school pedagogy that is not tailored to their needs.”⁵⁶ Even those programs more deliberately focused on legal education may fall short pedagogically, as “learning to ‘think like a lawyer’ is a gradual, cumulative process that occurs across many classes as students ‘soak up’ the patterns and rhythms of legal thought and argument in numerous core subjects.”⁵⁷ As Cross and Edwards quip, this process cannot be absorbed in “One class on copyright taught by an adjunct professor from the law school ...”⁵⁸

Even those students graduating with stronger legal training will, in their work with OA, find themselves dependent on interpretation as they apply guidelines like Fair Use. While some MLIS programs stand out for their legal education offerings,⁵⁹ MLIS programs as a whole must improve and broadly enforce training in the legal issues most essential to the practice of librarianship and information work generally. This foundational training can then be supplemented by more focused efforts for those professionals closely engaged with particular issues, such as privacy or copyright. Prominent ongoing copyright litigation—most recently, *Authors Guild, Inc. et al. v. HathiTrust et al.* and *Cambridge University Press et al. v. Patton et al.*—compels the need for continuing education to stay current on the evolving state of the law as new cases are decided. While Cross and Edwards survey and advocate for self-study and continuing legal education for librarians to ameliorate the perceived failures of MLIS-level legal training, this should follow—and supplement rather than replace—foundational training gained during the course of an MLIS and thus included in every librarian’s repertoire.

Formal and informal continuing professional development, including exposure to different models of OA and institutional SC, is a necessary element in training librarians in OA. Indeed, continuing development is integrally linked to the changing nature of the movement, necessary for new and seasoned librarians alike, and embedded in the many conferences, symposia, toolkits, and workshops dedicated to these issues. While LIS programs may instill a strong sense of the importance of access, assessing and developing these policies requires ongoing education in diverse, specialized areas. A variety of educational resources are readily available to libraries and librarians seeking continuing education.⁶⁰ Academic libraries must support librarians’ need for continual professional development, with funding opportunities, flexible personnel leave policies, and by facilitating a culture that encourages these efforts.

As a whole, however, MLIS programs should improve and extend cross-curricular offerings in legal education, as well as in repository training and the basic principles of OA. New librarians might not be hired for dedicated SC positions, but they should be equipped to manage their own scholarship and publications. This will include the ability and confidence to interpret publication agreements, deposit grey literature into digital repositories, seek permissions, and apply legal principles such as Fair Use. This foundational knowledge will better enable librarians to advise others on these questions and will help bridge the gap between librarians' own practices in making their research available OA.⁶¹

The Values Question

The second challenge in preparing librarians for OA work relates to this work's potential to extend into the realm of advocacy. This advocacy may hinge on the beliefs and principles of practitioners rather than—or in addition to—their assessment and response to institutional needs or policies. While OA has the potential to fit neatly into the missions of both library schools and academic libraries, variations within the OA movement themselves belie distinct missions and approaches. Libraries and librarians must identify and carve out their response to schisms in the larger movement.

For academic faculty, students, and librarians alike, OA is both an ethical movement and a scholarly publishing phenomenon with financial implications. As Lewis writes: "Open access journals claim two advantages: the first is pragmatic and the second is principled."⁶²

It is telling that an understanding of the "ethics, values, and foundational principles" of librarianship headlines ALA's Core Competencies, with advocacy and a sense of libraries' place in democratic society following closely behind. Traditionally, MLIS programs have not shied away from a mission-driven approach. However, this approach—or, potentially, set of assumptions—can come into tension with curricula focused on user assessments or libraries that emphasize their function as service organizations.

Fundamentally, the mission-driven approach to LIS education aligns with the values-based premise of librarianship in the United States. Indeed, students and librarians are likely to have chosen the profession of librarianship—and to have been attracted to LIS programs—with a sense of these values in mind. MLIS students, too, may be predisposed to the core principles of OA and interested in supporting the movement. "Access," in particular, has long commanded an ethical imperative in libraries, even as its meaning has shifted away from "freedom from censorship." As Herbert S. White wrote in 1989, access to information is "The big ethical issue for librarians, in their professional literature and in their educational emphasis..."⁶³

But this alignment is not always in the interest of full discourse. Indeed, in Boyd Keith Swigger's critique, this compulsion of belief occupies a troubling perch at the core of the profession:

"American librarianship devotes itself to social causes and to values that are related to practice, to the extent that holding what are considered appropriate beliefs and adhering to an approved ideology have become confounded with professional skills and knowledge. A plethora of ALA policy documents detail what librarians should believe."⁶⁴

MLIS programs in their current incarnation educate usability experts, information analysts, archivists, digital librarians, conservators, public and school librarians, records managers, LIS faculty, academic librarians, and many other types of information professionals, categories that themselves encompass an enormous range of specialties. The diversity of the population's career goals both complicates the prescription of values and meaning and compels the need to reference a common ground of mission and sensibility. As LIS educator Richard Cox writes: "Our task is not just to provide practical or vocational training; it is to push students to examine critical topics such as the ethics of information access and the public good of open access to information. iSchools, just as library schools, need a grand narrative that extends far beyond providing a ticket to a job."⁶⁵

Despite the potential alignment between librarians' shared values around access and the OA's movement overarching appeal to benefit the larger public good, librarians must critically recognize and evaluate the different models and approaches for implementing and funding OA. Library students and librarians alike must be critical of compulsory views and protective of academic freedom and dissent. As Lowell Martin argued in 1957: "Librarianship is an applied profession; judgment in meeting individual situations in particular circumstances is the heart of its practice."⁶⁶ Even as library and university policy-making around OA links to a multinational movement, it necessarily incurs local decisions.

Identifying personal and professional ethics and values around OA implementation, as well as cultivating an awareness of the legal framework that OA occupies, is a necessary early task for librarians engaged with this work, who will, it follows, advocate and educate more effectively, with a fuller awareness of the potential tradeoffs incurred by stakeholders such as university faculty. Paul Royster, the coordinator of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's institutional repository, recently voiced dissent with SPARC's stance on OA, which, as he describes it, dictates that "providing unlimited free access to materials is not enough to constitute 'open access': one must also supply unrestricted rights to re-use the materials."⁶⁷ Royster writes that he "could not in good conscience recommend to ... faculty depositors that they apply a Creative Commons license" that would ensure that their work

complied with SPARC's definition of OA.⁶⁸ His declaration called attention to tensions between the overarching goals of OA, in the "libre" form, the needs and concerns of UNL faculty contributing their work to the IR, and legal agreements worked out with publishers. These tensions manifested within his role as an advocate for access and for his university's faculty.

White provides a useful framework for teaching professional ethics in MLIS programs. He identifies the potential for librarians to "seek not only to define but also to claim ethics as something they possess and others fail to honor."⁶⁹ While MLIS programs reinforce shared professional values around access, instructors must also instill in students the capacity to question and analyze. White argues: "The role of library education is not to provide answers... but rather to make students aware of the complexity of problems and options," including the potential for conflict between professional and personal ethics.⁷⁰ Given the evolving policy landscape of OA efforts, librarians will be well advised to have a firm intellectual and ethical foundation for their arguments around OA, as well as a sense of where these arguments falter.

Conclusion

Academic librarians are well positioned to advocate for OA policies and to consider developing local collections that could be published OA. Through their placement within colleges and universities, librarians can influence local, institutional debate, behavior, and reward, as well as federal and international policies. Credentialed by MLIS programs tied to the American Library Association, librarians are expected to embody principles around access, preservation, and the public interest; additionally, and significantly, they wield control over budgetary decisions around scholarly publishing.

Over the past century, reform efforts around graduate library education have pointed to the need for programs to present core theoretical tenets of information, introduce an ethical foundation in the profession, and require practical experience or significant research. Even so, popular wisdom accedes that librarians do not spring fully formed from graduate programs but rather must spend their first years assimilating to the particular environment of libraries and developing professional identities around their librarianship.

MLIS programs are a natural source for outreach and education around the core tenets of OA. These programs can present generalizable, context-neutral approaches to OA, with instruction aimed at introducing competency with interpreting publishing agreements and rights management, offering exposure to repository platforms, applying laws and legal principles, and presenting rationale for OA. While students who initiate and cobble together programs of study with SC as a focus may

locate resources through research and self-teaching, the active, cross-curricular introduction of the area of SC will ensure that academic librarians as a whole are more familiar with the components of this emerging specialization and prepared to both support and lead innovations in the area.

It is easy to fall into the pattern of arguing that LIS education should be deeper and broader, as well as more focused, interdisciplinary, theoretical, practical, thoughtful, philosophical, values-driven, technical, traditional, and innovative. These critiques rest comfortably on the saturation of the market for librarians. But libraries, too, have a role to play in ensuring the continuing professional development of librarians, tailored to local programming in OA and SC, as well as providing leadership and direction in the evolving area of scholarly communication.

Acknowledgments

In writing this article, my greatest debt is to my colleagues in the Texas A&M University Libraries, who indelibly influenced my first year of librarianship. Additional thanks to Dustin A. Lewis and Marcel Q. LaFlamme for their thoughtful commentary and guidance and to Jennifer A. Jude and Brian J. Wong.

References

- ¹ The title draws on David Lewis's comment: "Open access journals claim two advantages: the first is pragmatic and the second is principled." See David W. Lewis, "The Inevitability of Open Access," *College & Research Libraries* 73:5 (September 2012): 493-506.
- ² Kathleen A. Newman, Deborah D. Blech, and Kimberly L. Armstrong, *Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives*, SPEC Kit 299 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2007).
- ³ Throughout this article, I use "MLIS" to reference the diversely-named masters-level degree awarded in the field of Library and Information Studies.
- ⁴ My alma mater, the School of Information at the University of Texas at Austin, offered intensive coursework on copyright while I was a student. DSpace was introduced in courses on Electronic and Digital Records, Digital Archiving, and Preservation, and other platforms were used in Digital Libraries courses, among others. UT has since added courses on Digital Repositories, Digital Humanities, and Scientific Data Informatics. In their survey of course offerings, using data collected in April 2010, Cross and Edwards identify UT as one of eight programs that feature four or more courses on legal issues. The other seven: University of Washington, University of Toronto, Pratt Institute, University of North Texas, University of Michigan, University of California-Los Angeles, and University of Albany-SUNY. See William M. Cross and Philip M. Edwards, "Preservice Legal Education for Academic Librarians within ALA-Accredited Degree Programs," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 11, no. 1 (2011): 533-550.
- ⁵ For a perspective on the challenges of LIS programs in the content of the university, see Richard J. Cox, *The Demise of the Library School: Personal Reflections on Professional Education in the Modern Corporate University* (Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press, 2010).
- ⁶ Particularly intriguing are debates over how to integrate practical experience into professional training. As Reece wrote in 1949: "However useful schools and courses of study may be, contacts with actual work remain indispensable. Even the most excellent formal professional discipline leaves a gap between itself and competency in performance. This view came to the fore repeatedly in proposals for prerequisite experience, so-called clinical schemes, and internships. ... Some persons indeed, expanding on the truism that in any case methods cannot be taught apart from a working situation, pictured generous practical experience as an inevitable accompaniment of the plan needed." E. L. Reece, *The Task and Training of Librarians* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1949), p. 58. Quoted in Robert D. Leigh, ed., *Major Problems in the Education of Librarians* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), 20.
- ⁷ Joanne Oud, "Adjusting to the Workplace: Transitions Faced by New Academic Librarians," *College & Research Libraries* 69, no. 3 (2008): 252-267. P. 252.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, 260-2.

⁹ Charles B. Lowry, "Scholarly Communication: a Lament and a Call for Change," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 12, no. 3 (2012): 237-58. p. 250.

¹⁰ As has been noted in this article, ARL released a SPEC Kit focused on the question of scholarly communication outreach in 2007. With 59% of ARL member libraries responding to the survey, 75% of respondents reported library engagement with scholarly communication education efforts. See Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, *Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives*.

¹¹ Dieter Stein, "Berlin 9 Open Access Conference," remarks to 158th ARL Meeting, Montreal, Quebec (May 4-6, 2011), <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/mm11sp-berlin.mp3>.

¹² David Lewis defines OA as "an alternative business model for the publication of scholarly journals." See Lewis, "The Inevitability of Open Access," 493.

¹³ Lewis, "The Inevitability of Open Access."

¹⁴ See, for example, Kate Worlock, "The pros and cons of Open Access," *Nature Web Focus*, Series: "Access to the Literature: The Debate Continues" (September 13 2004), <http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/34.html>; Karen Hunter, "Open Access: yes, no, maybe," *Nature Web Focus*, Series: "Access to the Literature: The Debate Continues" (March 19 2004) <http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/3.html>

¹⁵ Peter Suber, "Open Access Overview: Focusing on open access to peer-reviewed research articles and their preprints." <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm> Accessed September 3, 2012.

¹⁶ Richard Poynder writes: "Although the history of the Open Access movement can be traced back to at least 1994 (or earlier), its birth is widely held to have taken place at the 2001 Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI). Certainly, it was at this point that the term 'open access' was first used." See Richard Poynder, "BOAI-10: Interview with SPARC's Alma Swan," email to ALA Scholarly Communication listserv (September 14, 2012); "Read the Budapest Open Access Initiative," *Budapest Open Access Initiative* (<http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read>).

¹⁷ "Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing," (2003), <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/bethesda.htm>

¹⁸ "Berlin Declaration of Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities," *Open Access at the Max Planck Society* (2003), <http://oa.mpg.de/lang/en-uk/berlin-prozess/berliner-erklarung/>

¹⁹ Peter Suber, "Praising progress, preserving precision," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter* 77 (September 2, 2004). <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/09-02-04.htm#progress>

²⁰ Emphasis added. Stevan Harnad, "The Implementation of the Berlin Declaration on Open Access," *D-Lib Magazine* 11, no. 3 (March 2005). <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march05/harnad/03harnad.html> In 2008, Creative Commons's Science Commons blog reported: "Earlier this week, open access leader Peter Suber and 'archivangelist' Stevan Harnad reached consensus on terms to describe these two forms of open access: 'weak' OA (removing price barriers alone)

and 'strong' OA (removing price and permission barriers)." Dwentworth, "New consensus for defining open access," Science Commons blog (May 1, 2008): <http://sciencecommons.org/weblog/archives/2008/05/01/new-consensus-for-defining-open-access/> This terminology evolved to "gratis" and "libre" OA. See Peter Suber's blog: <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2008/04/strong-and-weak-oa.html>

²¹ Public Library of Science, The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition, Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, "HowOpenIsIt?: Open Access Spectrum," (2012), http://www.plos.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/OAS_English_web.pdf

²² See, for example, Andrea L. Foster, "U. of Iowa Writing Students Revolt Against a Plan They Say Would Give Away Their Work on the Web," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 13, 2008); Andrea L. Foster, "U. of Iowa Writing Students Quash Planned Open Access," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 28, 2008); Andrea L. Foster, "Readers Not Wanted: Student Writers Fight to Keep Their Work Off the Web," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 28, 2008). For further research on the potential impact of OA requirements on students' opportunities to publish revised texts, see: Gail McMillan, Marisa L. Ramirez, Joan Dalton, Max Read, and Nancy H. Seamans, "An Investigation of ETDs as Prior Publications: Findings from the 2011 NDLTD Publishers' Survey," in *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Electronic Theses and Dissertations*, September 13-17, 2011, Cape Town, South Africa. http://dl.cs.uct.ac.za/conferences/etd2011/papers/etd2011_mcmillan.pdf

²³ Lewis provides a review of the research on download and citation rates with OA materials. Lewis, "The Inevitability of Open Access," 505, FN4.

²⁴ Responding to the Iowa Writers Workshop controversy, Suber comments: "in my argument for mandating OA for ETDs, I make a point of adding that '[g]rad students who have good reasons to be exempt from the mandate should be exempted, not coerced,'" implicitly suggesting that the lack of an opt-out for fiction writers in the Iowa ETD OA mandate constituted a potentially coercive act. See Peter Suber, "Open Access News: March 13, 2008," <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2008/03/controversy-over-oa-for-fine-arts.html>.

²⁵ See Kara J. Malenfant, "Leading Change in the System of Scholarly Communication: A Case Study of Engaging Liaison Librarians for Outreach to Faculty," *College & Research Libraries* 71, no. 1 (2010): 63-76.

²⁶ Sarah L. Shreeves and Thomas H. Teper, "Looking backwards: Asserting control over historic dissertations," *College & Research Libraries News* 73, no. 9 (October 2012): 532-535, p. 535.

²⁷ Isaac Gilman and Marissa Ramirez, "What is in a Name? Introducing the *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*," *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1-2, p.1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1044>

²⁸ Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, *Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives*, 17.

²⁹ Critics have faulted scholarly communication for what is seen as an overemphasis on the economics of scholarly publishing and the potential of OA to provide a solution. As Alan Singleton editorializes: “‘scholarly communication’ properly defined is so much wider, and indeed more fascinating, than this modern quasi-definition implies. You have only to think of the basic ‘binary’ classification of the topic—i.e., into ‘informal’ and ‘formal’ communication, to start to see that. In the transmission of scholarly ideas, for example, not only anecdote but studies have long shown the critical importance of informal communication.” See Alan Singleton, “Scholarly communication—can we have our name back?” *Learned Publishing* 24, no. 1 (2011): 3-4, p. 3.

³⁰ ARL Serial Prices Project and the Association of Research Libraries, *Report of the ARL Serials Prices Project: A Compilation of Reports Examining the Serials Prices Problem Including Analyses from the Association of Research Libraries* (Washington, D.C., Association of Research Libraries, 1989), <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015015406617>

³¹ Mary M. Case, “Scholarly Communication: ARL as a Catalyst for Change,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 9, no. 3 (2009): 381-395, p. 382.

³² Ann Okerson, “Of Making Many Books There is No End,” in ARL Serials Prices Project and the Association of Research Libraries, *Report of the ARL Serials Prices Project: A Compilation of Reports Examining the Serials Prices Problem Including Analyses from the Association of Research Libraries*, (Washington, D.C., Association of Research Libraries, 1989), 40. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015015406617>

³³ Okerson, “Of Making Many Books There is No End,” 42.

³⁴ Okerson, “Of Making Many Books There is No End,” 45.

³⁵ Case, “Scholarly Communication: ARL as a Catalyst for Change,” 382. Quoting Association of Research Libraries, *Minutes of the 114th Meeting, May 10-11, 1989, Providence, Rhode Island* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1990), 63, 65.

³⁶ Okerson, “Of Making Many Books There is No End,” 42.

³⁷ This section is indebted to Case’s account of this institutional history. See Case, “Scholarly Communication: ARL as a Catalyst for Change,” 382-6.

³⁸ SPARC, “2011 SPARC Program Plan,” (January 2011).

http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/pplan_2011.pdf

³⁹ Peter Suber, “Removing the Barriers to Research: An Introduction to Open Access for Librarians” (2003), <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:3715477>. An abridged version of this text was published in *College & Research Libraries News* 64 (February 2003): 92-94, 113. For more on the relationship between OA and Creative Commons, see “Creative Commons and Open Access,” *Creative Commons*, http://wiki.creativecommons.org/Creative_Commons_and_Open_Access

⁴⁰ See Case, “Scholarly Communication: ARL as a Catalyst for Change,” 387.

⁴¹ "Assessment of the ACRL Scholarly Communications Program, 2002-2006," <http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/scholcomm/ACRLSCAssessmntFNLREVISED.pdf>

⁴² Association of College & Research Libraries, "ACRL Roadshow Workshop: Scholarly Communications: From Understanding to Engagement; ACRL Once Again Offering the Scholarly Communications Road Shows in 2012 with New Programmatic Elements and Cost Sharing Model," <http://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/scholcomm/roadshow>

⁴³ James L. Mullins found, when surveying nine ARL director-level librarians about "their experience with filling librarian or library professional positions in the past three years at their institution" that directors were aware of the need to mentor and formally develop those new to librarianship. He notes: "What was consistently mentioned in answer to this question ['If it appears that library/I schools are not preparing new graduates to assume positions within the changing environment of research libraries, what alternatives are you exploring to fill positions?'] was that directors are looking for new librarians who have a spark, an energy for what libraries are now and what they will be in the future, and who feel that the ambiguity that is today's library will be an opportunity not a threat." See James L. Mullins, "Are MLS Graduates Being Prepared for the Changing and Emerging Roles that Librarians Must Now Assume Within Research Libraries?" *Journal of Library Administration* 52, no. 1 (2012): 124-132.

⁴⁴ William M. Cross, "The State of the Scholarly Communication Librarian: A Content Analysis of Position Descriptions from Association of Research Libraries Member Institutions," Thesis submitted for MS in LS, School of Information and Library Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (April 2011). http://dc.lib.unc.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/s_papers/id/1424

⁴⁵ Maria Carpenter, Jolie Graybill, Jerome Offord Jr., Mary Piorun, "Envisioning the Library's Role in Scholarly Communication in the Year 2025," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 11, no. 2 (2011): 659-81.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of the gap between librarians' attitudes towards OA and their publishing behavior, see Holly Mercer, "Almost Halfway There: An Analysis of the Open Access Behaviors of Academic Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 72, no. 5 (2011): 443-453. Examining attitudes, Mercer cites Kristi L. Palmer, Emily Dill, and Charlene Christie, "Where There's a Will There's a Way? Survey of Academic Librarian Attitudes about Open Access," *College & Research Libraries* 70, no. 4 (2009): 315-35.

⁴⁷ No significant recent work has been done to assess the decision-making process that prospective MLIS applicants undergo when applying to and signing up to attend graduate programs. A small-scale study examining the decision points of students attending Emporia State University was published in 1980, relying on surveys conducted in 1978 and 1980. The study pinpointed "location, cost, accreditation, reputation of the school, familiarity with the parent institution, program content, public relations and publicity, and the available of a full summer program and off

campus courses” as the nine factors influencing choice of program. But the author accedes that factors such as reputation may be difficult for a candidate—or, indeed, a school itself—to assess. Reviewing the specializations and joint programs offered through the 61 ALA-accredited schools, she notes: “The number of possibilities seem endless. One school offers its students 12 different tracks.” (See Marylouise D. Meder, “Student Concerns in Choice of Library School,” *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 21, no. 1 (1980): 3-24.)

In the intervening years, the view of library schools from the perspective of the applicants has become even more complex, as specialized tracks have proliferated and spread and tuition costs expanded. Options are further expanded with the growth of online programs as well as online programs.

⁴⁸ Palakorn Achananuparp and Robert B. Allen, “Developing a Student-Friendly Repository for Teaching Principles of Repository Management,” paper presented at DigCCurr2007, Chapel Hill, NC, April 18-20, 2007,

http://ils.unc.edu/digccurr2007/papers/achananuparp_paper_8-2.pdf

⁴⁹ Suzie Allard and Nabil Kashyap, “Panel on Educational Needs,” Data Curation Profile Symposium, Purdue University, September 24, 2012.

⁵⁰ “ALA’s Core Competencies of Librarianship” Final version (Approved by the ALA Executive Board, October 25, 2008; Approved and adopted as policy by the ALA Council, January 27, 2009),

<http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/sites/ala.org.educationcareers/files/content/careers/corecomp/corecompetences/finalcorecompstat09.pdf>

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² For a discussion of the link between Accreditation and Core Competencies, see Renee D. McKinney, “Draft Proposed ALA Core Competencies Compared to ALA-Accredited, Candidate, and Precandidate Program Curricula: A Preliminary Analysis,” *Journal of Education for Library and Information Sciences* 47, no. 1 (2006): 52-77. For an example of an argument to enforce LIS curricular inclusion of a research methods course through accreditation requirements, see Soyeon Park, “Research Methods as a Core Competency,” *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 44, no. 1 (2003): 17-25.

⁵³ “ALA’s Core Competencies of Librarianship”

⁵⁴ Cross, “The State of the Scholarly Communication Librarian,” 25-7.

⁵⁵ Cross and Edwards, “Preservice Legal Education for Academic Librarians within ALA-Accredited Degree Programs,” 533.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 540.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ For a list of MLIS programs with particularly strong legal education offerings, see Cross and Edwards, “Preservice Legal Education for Academic Librarians within ALA-Accredited Degree Programs.

⁶⁰ These include, by are no means limited to, the ACRL Scholarly Communication Toolkit, ACRL Roadshow on Scholarly Communication, and the ACRL-ARL Institute on Scholarly Communication (including a webinar series).

⁶¹ See Mercer, "Almost Halfway There: An Analysis of the Open Access Behaviors of Academic Libraries."

⁶² Lewis, "The Inevitability of Open Access," 494.

⁶³ Herbert S. White, "Teaching Professional Ethics to Students of Library and Information Science," in *Ethics and the Librarian*, Papers presented at Allerton Park Institute, Number 31, October 29-31, 1989, ed. F. W. Lancaster (Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1991), 31-43, p. 36.

⁶⁴ Boyd Keith Swigger, *The MLS Project: An Assessment after Sixty Years* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2010), 75-6.

⁶⁵ Cox, *The Demise of the Library School*, xv.

⁶⁶ Lowell A. Martin, "Research in Education for Librarianship," *Library Trends* 6, no. 2 (1957): 207-218. P. 215. <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/5745>.

⁶⁷ Paul Royster, "Up from Under the 'Open Access' Bus," *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 1, no. 2 (2012): 1-3, p. 1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1045>.

⁶⁸ Royster, "Up from Under the 'Open Access' Bus," 2.

⁶⁹ White, "Teaching Professional Ethics to Students of Library and Information Science," 31.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 41.